



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,077	12/04/2003	Fabienne Pianta	2794-1-001	7960
7590 10/14/2008				
KLAUBER & JACKSON 4th Floor 411 Hackensack Avenue Hackensack, NJ 07601			EXAMINER FORTUNA, JOSE A	
			ART UNIT 1791	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,077

Applicant(s)

PIANTA ET AL.

Examiner

José A. Fortuna

Art Unit

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-24 and 26-43 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). These rejections were set forth in the prior Office action mailed on February 11, 2008.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on June 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The change of the word "Paste" to "Pulp" has been accepted. Note that even though the word "pulp" was not previously used, the changes have been considered that do not add new matter, since one of ordinary skill in the art would have known that "pulp" was the intended meaning of the word "paste."

With regard to the 102/103 rejections, applicants argue that the addition of the fillers on the plies of the cited reference is done to the wet web and that in the current application the application of the fillers/pigments is done when the tissues have a dry content of about 15%, the arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

- The claims are broader than the arguments. The claims do not recite the consistency of the layers/plies at the joining point and there is nothing in the claims that suggest/limits/recites that those claimed steps are done in that particular sequence. Claim 43 seems to evidence that the fillers are added earlier at the wet end, since they, the fillers, are added to the fibers. Therefore the references read on the claims as claimed.
- Even if the claims are amended to read as applicants argue, Coleman clearly teaches that the introduction of the fillers is done to at the formed web and that the figures only show a preferred embodiment. This is evidenced by the fact that Coleman states that the fillers can be and preferably are added with a binder, such binder joining or help in the joining of the plies, see column 1, lines 28-40, column 2, lines 19-38; column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 12. Therefore, the claims at the very least would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.
- As to claims 41-42 the rejections still stand, because, those claims are product by process claims and the papers of the cited references would have the same properties as the ones claimed. As the afore mentioned claims are product by process claims, it is deemed that "[A]ny difference imparted by the product by process claims would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art the burden of proof is shifted to the applicants to establish that their product is patentably distinct, ..." In

re Brown, 173 U.S.P.Q. 685, and In re Fessmann, 180 U.S.P.Q. 324. Further, "[P]rocess limitations are significant only to the extent that they distinguish the claimed product over the prior art product." In re Luck, 177 U.S.P.Q. 523 (1973).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/José A Fortuna/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

JAF